## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

| United States of America  | ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL   |
|---|--|
| v.<br>James Glass, Jr.  | Coop No. 4:47 or 000FG C IO  |
| Defendant   | Case No. 1:17-cr-00056-GJQ   |
| After conducting a detention hearing under the that the defendant be detained pending trial.  | e Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), I conclude that these facts require  |
| P   | art I – Findings of Fact   |
|   | escribed in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has previously been convicted of offense that would have been a federal offense if federal jurisdiction had |
| a crime of violence as defined in 18 U which the prison term is 10 years or m   | .S.C. § 3156(a)(4), or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for nore.   |
| an offense for which the maximum se   | ntence is death or life imprisonment.  |
| an offense for which a maximum priso  | on term of ten years or more is prescribed in:   |
| a felony committed after the defendar U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or compare  | nt had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 able state or local offenses.  |
| any felony that is not a crime of violen  | ice but involves:  |
| a minor victim the possession or use of a failure to register under   | a firearm or destructive device or any other dangerous weapon 18 U.S.C. § 2250   |
| (2) The offense described in finding (1) was cor or local offense.  | mmitted while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state  |
| (3) A period of less than 5 years has elapsed si offense described in finding (1).  | nce the date of conviction defendant's release from prison for the   |
|   | ole presumption that no condition will reasonably assure the safety of another defendant has not rebutted that presumption.                        |
| Δ.  | Alternative Findings (A)   |
| ✓ (1) There is probable cause to believe that the order   | defendant has committed an offense   |
| ✓ for which a maximum prison term of to Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C.)  The depth of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C.)  Th |  |
| under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).   | ution patablished by finding (4) that no condition or combination of conditions  |
| <ul> <li>(2) The defendant has not rebutted the presum<br/>will reasonably assure the defendant's appe</li> </ul>   | ption established by finding (1) that no condition or combination of conditions earance and the safety of the community.                           |
|   | Alternative Findings (B)   |
| (1) There is a serious risk that the defendant wi   | • •  |
| <del></del> · · ·   | Il endanger the safety of another person or the community.   |
|   | ement of the Reasons for Detention   |
| evidence a preponderance of the evidence that:  1. Defendant has a lengthy criminal history including  2. Defendant has a lack of residential and other ties  3. Defendant has a history of substance abuse.  4. Defendant has engaged in criminal activity while up  | to the Western District of Michigan.  under supervision.   |
| 5. Defendant's criminal history includes failures to ap   | ppear.   |

## Part III - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or a designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to consult privately with defense counsel. On order of United States Court or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for a court appearance.

| Date: | March 1, 2017 | Judge's Signature: | /s/ Ellen S. Carmody                    |
|-------|---------------|--------------------|---|
|       |               | Name and Title:    | Ellen S. Carmody, U.S. Magistrate Judge |